

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested.

**I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS**

None of the claims are amended herein.

Claims 11-14 are "objected to" and claim 16 is allowed.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-16 are currently pending and under consideration in the present application.

**II. SPECIFICATION**

In item 2, on page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that the Abstract is objected to because it contains more than 150 words. The Abstract is amended herein to overcome the objection.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the objection is overcome.

**III. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-3 UNDER 35 U.S.C § 102(B) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY MAKRIS (GB-2286111)**

The present invention as recited in claim 1, relates to a cooking apparatus, which comprises "a plurality of reflecting members provided at predetermined positions around a rear surface of the heating unit, the reflecting members installed to be spaced apart from each other by a predetermined gap to provide an air layer between the reflecting members."

Makris discloses a grill having a rectangular chamber 11, an open top 13 covered with a grid 14, a radiant device 23 mounted to direct heat upwards toward the grid 14, and reflectors 24 to reflect heat in the direction of the grid 14. Makris asserts, "in order to make the heating device more efficient, the cover is protected by a reflector 24 to reflect heat from the heating device away from the underside of the cover towards the center of the grill, in the general direction of the grid" (see lines 7-11, on page 3 of Makris).

However, Makris provides a grill that has only one reflector 24, which is different from the present invention that provides a plurality of reflecting members (see claim 1). Moreover, the reflector 24 of Makris is positioned in front of the radiant device 23, which is different from the claimed reflecting members that are provided at a rear surface of the heating unit (see claim 1). In the present invention, the claimed reflecting members are installed at the rear surface of the

heating unit and are spaced apart from each other by a predetermined gap to provide an air layer between the reflecting members (see claim 1). It is submitted that the above-described features as recited in claim 1 of the present invention are not disclosed or suggested by Makris.

Claims 2 and 3 depend from claim 1. For at least the reasons that claim 1 distinguishes over the cited prior art, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2 and 3 also distinguish over the cited prior art.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

**IV. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 4, 5, 7, 8 AND 15 UNDER 35 U.S.C § 103(A) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER MAKRIS (GB-2286111) IN VIEW OF HUCK (US 3,154,004)**

The comments in section III above, also apply here because, similar to claim 1, claim 4 relates to a cooking apparatus that comprises "a plurality of reflecting members provided at predetermined positions around the heating unit, the reflecting members installed to be spaced apart from each other by a predetermined gap to provide an air layer between the reflecting members." Thus, Makris does not teach the features recited in claim 4 of the present invention.

The Huck reference is cited to show a removable tray. However, Huck fails to teach or suggest the claimed reflecting members recited in claim 4. It is submitted that Makris and Huck, either alone or in combination, do not teach the features recited in claim 4 of the present invention.

Claims 5, 7, 8 and 15 depend from claim 4. For at least the reasons that claim 4 distinguishes over the cited prior art, it is respectfully submitted that claims 5, 7, 8 and 15 also distinguish over the cited prior art.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the objection is overcome.

**V. REJECTION OF CLAIM 6 UNDER 35 U.S.C § 103(A) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER GB-2286111 IN VIEW OF HUCK AS APPLIED TO CLAIM 4 ABOVE AND FURTHER IN VIEW OF KR-200216089**

The comments in section IV above, apply here because claim 6 depends from claim 4. For at least the reasons that claim 4 distinguishes over the cited prior art, it is respectfully submitted that claim 6 also distinguishes over the cited prior art.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the objection is overcome.

**VI. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 9 AND 10 UNDER 35 U.S.C § 103(A) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER GB-2286111 IN VIEW OF HUCK AS APPLIED TO CLAIM 4 ABOVE AND FURTHER IN VIEW OF HENNICK (US 5,189,945)**

The comments in section IV above, apply here because claims 9 and 10 depend from claim 4. For at least the reasons that claim 4 distinguishes over the cited prior art, it is respectfully submitted that claims 9 and 10 also distinguish over the cited prior art.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

**VII. CONCLUSION**


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that each of the claims patentably distinguishes over the prior art, and therefore defines allowable subject matter. A prompt and favorable reconsideration of the rejection along with an indication of allowability of all pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 10-22-04

By:   
Derrick L. Fields  
Registration No. 50,133

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501